

REMARKS

I. Introduction

With the cancellation herein without prejudice of claim 20, and the addition of new claim 29, claims 15 to 19, and 21 to 29 are pending in the present application. Claim 15 has been amended herein without prejudice to include the features of canceled claim 20. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants note with appreciation the acknowledgment of the claim for foreign priority and the acknowledgment that all certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

II. Information Disclosure Statement

Regarding the Information Disclosure Statement, Applicants submit herewith a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement citing the documents that were indicated to have not been received by the Office.

III. Objection to the Specification

As regards the objection to the Specification, the M.P.E.P. § 1893.03(e) states that “it is not necessary for the applicant to amend the first sentence(s) of the specification to reference the international application number that was used to identify the application during international processing of the application by the international authorities prior to commencement of the national stage” (emphasis added). Withdrawal of this objection is therefore respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claims 15 to 21 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 15 to 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,782,320 (“Shier”). Claim 20 has been canceled herein without prejudice, thereby rendering moot the present rejection with respect to claim 20. It is respectfully submitted that Shier does not render unpatentable the presently pending claims for at least the following reasons.

In order for a claim to be rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the prior art must teach or suggest each element of the claim. See Northern Telecom, Inc. v. Datapoint Corp., 908 F.2d 931, 934 (Fed. Cir. 1990), cert. denied,

111 S. Ct. 296 (1990); In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 834 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In addition, as clearly indicated by the Supreme Court, it is “important to identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the [prior art] elements” in the manner claimed. See KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007). Further, the Supreme Court in *KSR* noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit. M.P.E.P. §2143.

Claim 15, as presented, relates to a method for adjusting an electrical resistance of a resistor run running in meandering windings and situated between two layers, the method including, *inter alia*, the features of adjusting the electrical resistance to a specified value, and cutting open the burn-up segments by sending energy-controlled current pulses through the burn-up segments, *wherein circuit traces are routed to connecting locations of the burn-up segments and the meandering windings, and wherein for cutting open a burn-up segment, the current pulse is injected into the two circuit traces that are routed to a selected burn-up segment.*

Shier does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the claimed features of claim 15, as presented. Shier merely indicates cutting resistor elements using a beam of radiation from a laser. (Shier, col. 2, lines 21 to 23; col. 2, lines 31 to 34; col. 3, lines 32 to 37; and col. 5, lines 12 to 17). Also, Shier, at col. 1, line 63, mentions merely a current pulse to blow open metal shorts. However, Shier does not disclose how the current pulse is to be applied to the metal shorts. In addition, Shier also does not disclose how it is to be ensured that the current pulse cuts open a selected metal short in a targeted manner and not a different metal short or another part of the resistor track. Nowhere does Shier disclose these features of the application of the current pulse in a targeted manner, as provided for in the context of claim 15, as presented. Further, it is respectfully submitted that the sections of Shier cited by the Office Action (col. 3, lines 27 to 30; col. 1, line 63; col. 4, lines 44 to 47) as teaching the application of the current pulse do not, in fact, teach such an application of the current pulse. (Office Action, p. 4). Therefore, Shier does not disclose, or even suggest, the features of cutting open the burn-up segments by sending energy-controlled current pulses through the burn-up segments, *wherein circuit traces are routed to connecting locations of the burn-up segments and the meandering*

windings, and wherein for cutting open a burn-up segment, the current pulse is injected into the two circuit traces that are routed to a selected burn-up segment.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Shier does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claim 15, as presented. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Shier does not render unpatentable the presently pending claims for at least the foregoing reasons.

Thus, as for claims 16 to 19, and 21, which ultimately depend from and therefore include all of the features included in claim 15, it is respectfully submitted that Shier does not render unpatentable these dependent claims for at least the reasons more fully set forth above.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claims 22, and 24 to 28 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 22, and 24 to 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Shier and U.S. Patent No. 5,844,122 (“Kato”). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Shier and Kato does not render unpatentable the present claims for at least the following reasons.

Claims 22, and 24 to 28 ultimately depend from claim 15, as presented. As more fully set forth above, Shier does not disclose, or even suggest, the features of cutting open the burn-up segments by sending energy-controlled current pulses through the burn-up segments, *wherein circuit traces are routed to connecting locations of the burn-up segments and the meandering windings, and wherein for cutting open a burn-up segment, the current pulse is injected into the two circuit traces that are routed to a selected burn-up segment.* Since Kato merely indicates trimming a potentiometric resistor or a serial resistor by a laser (Kato, col. 3, lines 42 to 65), Kato also does not disclose, or even suggest, the features of cutting open the burn-up segments by sending energy-controlled current pulses through the burn-up segments, *wherein circuit traces are routed to connecting locations of the burn-up segments and the meandering windings, and wherein for cutting open a burn-up segment, the current pulse is injected into the two circuit traces that are routed to a selected burn-up segment,* and thus, fails to cure this critical deficiency.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Shier and Kato does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claim 15,

from which claims 22, and 24 to 28 ultimately depend. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Shier and Kato does not render unpatentable claims 22, and 24 to 28, which ultimately depend from claim 15.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VI. Rejection of Claim 23 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Shier and U.S. Patent No. 3,639,785 (“Moriyasu”). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Shier and Moriyasu does not render unpatentable the present claim for at least the following reasons.

Claim 23 ultimately depends from claim 15, as presented. As more fully set forth above, Shier does not disclose, or even suggest, the features of cutting open the burn-up segments by sending energy-controlled current pulses through the burn-up segments, *wherein circuit traces are routed to connecting locations of the burn-up segments and the meandering windings, and wherein for cutting open a burn-up segment, the current pulse is injected into the two circuit traces that are routed to a selected burn-up segment*. Moriyasu also does not disclose, or even suggest, the features of cutting open the burn-up segments by sending energy-controlled current pulses through the burn-up segments, *wherein circuit traces are routed to connecting locations of the burn-up segments and the meandering windings, and wherein for cutting open a burn-up segment, the current pulse is injected into the two circuit traces that are routed to a selected burn-up segment*, and thus, fails to cure this critical deficiency.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Shier and Moriyasu does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claim 15, from which claim 23 ultimately depends. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Shier and Moriyasu does not render unpatentable claim 23, which ultimately depends from claim 15.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VII. New Claim 29

New claim 29 has been added herein. It is respectfully submitted that claim 29 adds no new matter and is fully supported by the present application, including the Substitute Specification, e.g. at page 5, lines 12 to 31.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 29 is patentable over the references relied upon for at least the reason that the references relied upon do not disclose, or even suggest, the features of cutting open the burn-up segments by sending energy-controlled current pulses through the burn-up segments, and *before the cutting open of a selected burn-up segment, heating locally the selected burn-up segment, whereby a specific resistance of the selected burn-up segment is increased locally during the current pulse*, as recited in claim 29.

VIII. Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 23, 2008

By: /Clifford A. Ulrich/ (Reg. No. 42,194) for:
Gerard A. Messina
Reg. No. 35,952

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646